

JUL 17 2012

Miguel Figueroa Exodo 80, Inc. 7274 NW 25 Street Miami, FL 33122

RE: MUR 6531

www.Obama-Biden2012.org

Exodo 80, Inc. Miguel Figueroa

Dear Mr. Figueroa:

On February 16, 2012, the Federal Election Commission ("Commission") notified www.Obama-Biden2012.org, Exodo 80, Inc., and you, in your individual capacity, of a complaint filed by Obama for America alleging violations of certain sections of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended (the "Act"). A copy of the complaint was forwarded to you at that time.

Upon further review of the allegations contained in the complaint and information supplied by you, the Commission, on June 29, 2012, found that there is reason to believe that Obama-Biden 2012, Exodo 80, Inc., and you violated 2 U.S.C. §§ 441h(b) and 441d(a). The Factual and Legal Analysis, which formed a basis for the Commission's findings, is attached for your information.

You may submit any factual or legal materials that you believe are relevant to the Commission's consideration of this matter. Please submit such materials to the General Counsel's Office within 15 days of receipt of this letter. Where appropriate, statements should be submitted under oath. In the absence of additional information, the Commission may find probable cause to believe that a violation has occurred and proceed with conciliation.

Please note that you have a legal obligation to preserve all documents, records, and materials relating to this matter until such time as you are notified that the Commission has closed its file in this matter. See 18 U.S.C. § 1519.

If you are interested in pursuing pre-probable cause conciliation, you should so request in writing. See 11 C.F.R. § 111.18(d). Upon receipt of the request, the Office of the General Counsel will make recommendations to the Commission either proposing an agreement in settlement of the matter or recommending declining that pre-probable cause conciliation be

Miguel Figueroa MUR 6531 Page 2

pursued. The Office of the General Counsel may recommend that pre-probable cause conciliation not be entered into at this time so that it may complete its investigation of the matter. Further, the Commission will not entertain requests for pre-probable cause conciliation after briefs on probable cause have been mailed to the respondent.

Requests for extensions of time will not be routinely granted. Requests must be made in writing at least five days prior to the due date of the response and specific good cause must be demonstrated. In addition, the Office of the General Counsel ordinarily will not give extensions beyond 20 days.

If you intend to be represented by counsel in this matter, please advise the Commission by completing the enclosed form stating the name, address, and telephone number of such counsel, and authorizing such counsel to receive any natifications and other communications from the Commission.

This matter will remain confidential in accordance with 2 U.S.C. §§ 437g(a)(4)(B) and 437g(a)(12)(A) unless you notify the Commission in writing that you wish the matter to be made public.

If you have any questions, please contact Margaret Ritzert Howell, the attorney assigned to this matter, at (202) 694-1650.

On behalf of the Commission,

Carori Co. +C

Caroline C. Hunter

Chair

Enclosures

Factual and Legal Analysis

1 2	FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION FACTUAL AND LEGAL ANALYSIS				
3					
4 5 6 7 8	E		Obama-Biden 2012 Exodo 80 Inc. Miguel Figueroa	MUR: 6531	
9	I.	GENERATI	ON OF MATTER		
10	This matter was generated by a complaint filed by Obama for America ("OFA"). See				
11	2 U.S.C. § 437(g)(a)(1).				
12	II.	FACTUAL.	AND LEGAL ANALYSIS	•	
13		A. Factu	ıal Background		
14		Exodo 80 Inc	:. ("Exodo 80") is registered w	ith the Florida Department of State as a non-	
15	profit corporation. Articles of Incorporation (June 13, 2011), available at www.dos.state.fl.us.				
16	According to its website, Exodo 80 is a "nonprofit foundation dedicated to creating organization				
17	that are designed to work for the betterment of life and human life." See www.exodo80.com.				
18	The website lists and links to the websites of eight other organizations that it "sponsors," one of				
19	which is "Obama-Biden 2012" at www.obama-biden2012.org. Miguel Figueroa is the president				
20	and registered agent of Exodo 80.				
21		While the ho	me page of Exodo 80's websit	e continues to display a link to the Obama-	
22	Bide	Biden 2012 website, which was functioning as recently as June 5, 2012, it is no longer			
23	opera	operational. According to previously downloaded pages of the Obama-Richn website, Obama-			
24	Bide	Biden 2012 sought to create clubs to support the re-election of the President. See www.obama-			
25	<u>bider</u>	biden2012.org (on file with the Commission). The website prominently featured the OFA logo			
26	and an image of President Obama and Vice President Biden superimposed over what appears to				
27	be an	audience at a	campaign rally. The website p	rovided examples of activities undertaken by	

MUR 6531 (Obama-Biden 2012, et al.) Factual & Logal Analysis Page 2 of 6

- 1 Obama-Biden 2012, including distributing flyers, postcards, and souvenirs on the street; placing
- 2 "bumber [sic] stickers on automobiles;" and giving "cloths [sic], food, and hope to the
- 3 homeless." Id. The website also included a tab labeled "Donate Now," which allowed visitors
- 4 to use Paypal to make online donations to Obama-Biden 2012. See id. Another tab, labeled
- 5 "Souvenirs," linked to a page that stated, "When you donate to Obama-Biden2012.org, we will
- 6 be happy to send you the following gifts and souvenirs," and included images of t-shirts, key
- 7 chains, and coffee raugs featuring the OFA logo and nictures of the candidates. *Id.*
- In the "Comments" section of the Obama-Biden 2012 website, one visitor stated, "I
- 9 would like to sign up for the 2012 re-election campaign to volunteer for My President and Vice-
- 10 President . . . Let me know how to get started with helping them get Re-Elected." Margaret
- Phipps, Comment to Obama-Biden 2012 (June 25, 2011, 6:23 pm), http://obama-
- 12 biden2012.org/wordpress/?p=4.
- Obama-Biden 2012 was also responsible for a direct mail piece asking recipients to
- "work for Obama-Biden reelection," and directing them to www.obama-biden2012.org. See
- 15 Compl. Attach. 1. The mail piece provided recipients with a form to make a "tax free
- 16 contribution," which instructed them to make checks payable to Obama-Biden 2012 or click on
- 17 the "Donate Now" tab on its website. Id.
- OFA alleges that the Obama-Biden 2012 website and direct mailer fraudulently represent
- 19 Obama-Biden 2012 as an organization acting on behalf of OFA for the purpose of soliciting
- contributions, in violation of 2 U.S.C. § 441h(b). Compl. at 2. OFA states that it did not
- 21 establish or authorize <u>www.obama-biden2012.org</u>, which misappropriates OFA's website logo

The link to Paypai was functional in March 2012, but when visited on May 11, 2012, the link to Paypal had been removed, and the page instructed visitors to donate by check made payable to Exodo 80. When last visited on June 5, 2012, the page stated that Obama-Biden 2012 was no longer accepting donations, and included an image of the April 6, 2012, clarification letter. See infra fn. 2.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MUR 6531 (Obama-Biden 2012, et al.) Factual & Legal Analysis Page 3 of 6

- and merchandise. Id. at 1. OFA also states that it has never received any contribution from, or
- 2 had any association with, Obama-Biden 2012. *Id.*
- In response to the complaint, Respondents take responsibility for the direct mail piece,
- 4 stating that, "the reason for the sending of these letters was [sic] independent actions to support
- 5 the reelection of Obama." Resp. at 1. Figueroa also claims, however, that, "our intention was
- 6 not to make fraudulent acts." Id. at 2. The response offers to provide Exodo 80's bank
- statements to show that it reneived no external funding, and states that it will stop sending letters
- 8 on behalf of Obama-Biden 2012, discontinue the website, return any future contributions, and
- 9 "destroy any advertising." Id. at 1-2.²

Figueroa filed two supplemental responses. On April 10, 2012, he submitted a response asserting that Exodo 80 had returned a \$100 donation, but which also suggested that Exodo 80 intended to use donations to Obama-Biden 2012 to finance other programs: "EXODO80 has eight programs that are sleeping because their only financial support broke. But through work www.obama-biden.org would receive a donation as we could to work in other programs"

Supp. Resp., Apr. 12, 2012 (hereinafter, "April Response"). This response also included what appears to be a request for donations to pay for a trailer emblazoned with "Obama-Biden 2012" and pictures of the candidates. April Response at 2. On May 11, 2012, Figueroa submitted a second supplemental response consisting of copies of two voided checks made out to Obama-Biden 2012, totaling \$300, and two bank statements for Exodo 80, Inc., DBA Obama-Biden 2012. Second Supp. Resp., May 11, 2012 (hereinafter, "May Response"). The first statement, dated November 30, 2011, shows \$100.16 in deposits and no withdrawals. The second

The Office of the General Counsel sent Figueroa a clarification letter advising him not to "destroy" any materials pertaining to this matter, and accepting his offer to provide Exodo 80's bank statements. Letter from Daniel A. Petalas, Assoc. Gen. Counsel, FEC to Miguel Figueroa, President, Exodo 80, Inc. (Apr. 6, 2012).

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MUR 6531 (Obama-Biden 2012, et al.) Factual & Legal Analysis Page 4 of 6

- statement, dated February 29, 2012, shows no deposits and withdrawals of \$87.50, the total
- 2 balance of the account at that time. Figueroa asserts that this was the last bank statement before
- 3 he closed the account.

B. Legal Analysis

1. Fraudulent Misrepresentation

The Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended, (the "Act") prohibits a person from fraudulently misrepresenting himself as speaking, writing, or otherwise acting for or on behalf of any candidate or political party or employee or agent thereof for the purpose of soliciting contributions or donations. 2 U.S.C. § 441h(b); see also 11 C.F.R. § 110.16. Section 441h differs from common law fraudulent misrepresentation in that it does not require proof of the common law requirements of justifiable reliance and damages. See Disclaimers, Fraudulent Solicitation, Civil Penalties, and Personal Use of Campaign Funds, 67 Fed. Reg. 76,962, 76,969 (Dec. 13, 2002) (explanation and justification) (citing Neder v. United States, 527 U.S. 1, 24-25 (1999)). Additionally, even absent an express misrepresentation, a scheme devised with the intent to defraud is deemed a fraud under the Act and Commission regulations if it was reasonably calculated to decrive persons of ordinary prudence and comprehension. See United States v. Thomas, 377 F.3d 232, 242 (2d Cir. 2004) (citing Silverman v. United States, 213 F.2d 405 (5th Cir. 1954)); FEC v. Novacek, 739 F.Supp.2d 957, 961 (N.D. Tex. 2010) (finding that defendants knowingly and willfully violated 2 U.S.C. § 441h(b)); see also Factual & Legal Analysis at 9, MUR 5951 (Californians for Change). Respondents represent themselves as acting on behalf of OFA in several ways. Aside from operating under the name "Obama-Biden 2012" at the domain name www.obamabiden2012.org, they placed the OFA logo both on the pages of this website and on merchandise

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

MUR 6531 (Obama-Biden 2012, et al.) Factual & Legal Analysis
Page 5 of 6

- 1 that it advertised on this website. The website also featured photographs of volunteers in
- 2 Obama-Biden 2012 t-shirts, apparently serving food to the homeless. At least one visitor to the
- 3 site appears to have believed that the organization is acting on behalf of OFA, because she left a
- 4 comment stating that she would like to sign up for the 2012 reelection effort. Additionally,
- 5 Respondents' direct mail piece invites recipients to "work for Obama-Biden reelection."

6 Obama-Biden 2012 appears to have misrepresented itself as being associated with OFA

7 for the purpose of soliciting donations or contributions. The website festured a link to "Donate

Now," which until recently asked visitors to make a donation to Obama-Biden 2012 via Paypal.

Similarly, the direct mail piece invites recipients to make a "tax free contribution" to Obama-

Biden 2012, and provides various options by which to do so.³

The Obama-Biden 2012 website and mailer appear capable of misleading persons of ordinary comprehension. There is no dispute that Respondents used OFA's campaign logo and candidate images to solicit contributions and donations without the authorization of OFA. There is no information to indicate that Respondents had any intention of forwarding the contributions they received to OFA; instead, the April Response seems to indicate that they intended to use the contributions to fund their other programs. Figueroa specifically asserts, however, that the Respondents did not act with the intent to defraud.

Based on the available information, which indicates that Obama-Bidon 2012 represented itself as acting on behalf of OFA to solicit contributions in a scheme reasonably calculated to deceive, the Commission found reason to believe that the Respondents violated 2 U.S.C.

21 § 441h(b).

It is not entirely clear, however, whether Figueroa's intent was to defraud potential donors or to establish an unauthorized campaign auxiliary organization.

2. <u>Disclaimer Violation</u>

Under the Act, public communications that solicit contributions are required to include a
disclaimer as to who paid for and authorized the communication, and specifically state whether
the communication was authorized by a candidate or candidate's committee. 2 U.S.C. § 441d(a)
11 C.F.R. § 110.11(a)(3). Commission regulations define "public communication" to include a
mass mailing, but not internet communications, except for those placed for a fee on another
person's website. 11 C.F.R. § 100.26.
Obama-Biden 2012's website constitutes an internet communication, but not one that was
placed for a fee on another person's website. Accordingly, it does not qualify as a public
communication under 11 C.F.R. § 100.26 and does not violate the Act. While there is no
information as to the exact quantity disbursed, the direct mail piece, however, appears to
constitute a mass mailing under 11 C.F.R. § 100.27, and therefore a public communication under
11 C.F.R. § 100.26. Because the direct mail piece does not include the information required by
the statute, the Commission found reason to believe that Respondents violated 2 U.S.C.

§ 441d(a) by failing to include a proper disclaimer on the communication.